



Attorney Docket No. 0670-208

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Kenichi SHIRAISHI et al.

Serial No. 09/247,826

Filed: February 11, 1999

For: A METHOD FOR REMOVING AM
NEIGHBORING INTERFERENCE
AND A CIRCUIT FOR THE SAME

) Group Art Unit: 2644

) Examiner: X. Mei

) CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

) I hereby certify that this correspondence is
) being deposited with the United States Postal
) Service with sufficient postage as First Class
) Mail in an envelope addressed to:
) Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
) Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

11-14-05

) Adrian M. Stamps

RESPONSE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The Official Action mailed August 11, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 13, 2003.

Claims 2 and 3 are pending in the present application, all of which are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action rejects claims 2 and 3 as obvious based on JP 53-002020 to Sato et al. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the Official Action has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available

OK to enter
in the